



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/057,990	04/25/2002	Yechiel Roseman	01/23251	2508

7590 03/12/2004

G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.
c/o ANTHONY CASTORINA
SUITE 207
2001 JEFFERSON DAVIS HIGHWAY
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

HAMILTON, KIMBERLY Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2635

DATE MAILED: 03/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/057,990

Applicant(s)

ROSEMAN, YECHIEL

Examiner

Kimberly Hamilton

Art Unit

2635

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 10 and 13-18 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 January 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5-16-2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: on page 10, line 13, the applicant refers to the coils **46** and **47** for Fig. 8, but the reference numbers are not shown in the drawing. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-12, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Kaish (US 4494114).

Regarding claims 1, 2, and 7, Kaish teaches a security arrangement for rendering microprocessor controlled electronic equipment of being inoperative after an occurrence of disabling event; thus, the equipment (or body) will remain inoperative until the private access code (or identification code) is entered (col. 3, lines 5-13). Kaish teaches that the microprocessor chip 14 can be programmed to have an access code for identifying the equipment (or body) that must be entered by an authorized individual as a means to prevent theft (col. 5, lines 22-28). In addition, as mentioned above, the body may be any form of

electrical equipment (col. 6, lines 3-9). Hence, the equipment with the identification may be a vehicle. Moreover, Kaish teaches that the physical removal of the equipment (the car radio 12) from the electrical source will result in disablement, because the electrical connection was interrupted (Abs. lines 4-9). Furthermore, Kaish teaches that the device comprises a power interrupt detector circuit 28 that is associated with the microprocessor chip 14 of the body 12 (col. 7, lines 55-58). Additionally, as aforementioned, Kaish teaches that in the event of a power interruption, for instance by theft, the electrical chip 14 is reset and disables the equipment or body 12 from normal operation even if the equipment/body 12 was reinstalled into either the same or a different vehicle (col. 8, lines 10-17). Henceforth, the radio 12 would only become activated after the correct identification code was entered (col. 8, lines 17-18). Also, Fig. 1 illustrates the electrical microprocessor chip 14, which is a part of the body (read as car radio) 12. Also, Fig. 1, illustrates the power interruption detector 28.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Kaish teaches that the body may be an automobile radio, a television, a videocassette recorder, a computer, a stereo, amongst other diverse electrical equipment. In turn, the body may be an automobile or a controller of a refueling system for automobiles, for they are electrical equipment (col. 6, lines 3-9).

Regarding claim 8, Kaish teaches that the microprocessor chip 14 is capable of being programmed to identify the access code for the equipment, which is an electrical device (col. 3, lines 59-64). In addition, as earlier mention, Kaish teach that the electrical equipment may be any diverse electrical equipment (col. 6, lines 3-9). Hence, the equipment (or body) may be a controller from a vehicle and/or the fueling system of a vehicle.

Regarding claims 4, 9, 11 and 12, Kaish teaches a microprocessor chip 14 that is built into car radio 12 (col. 6, lines 10-11). Being that the microprocessor is "built in" the chip is irremovable from the car radio 12, for the microprocessor is an actual part of the car

radio. In turn, the car radio 12 provides housing for the microprocessor chip 14. In addition, as aforementioned, the microprocessor chip is 14 capable of being programmed to identify the access code for the equipment, which is an electrical device (col. 3, lines 59-64). Also, Kaish teaches that the microprocessor controlled electronic device becomes disabled when physically removed from the electrical source (Abs. 2-7).

Regarding claim 19, Kaish teaches the microprocessor as a means to control the security of an electrical device, such as a car radio, which has the built in microprocessor (col. 6, lines 17-19).

Regarding claim 20, as aforementioned, Kaish teaches that the security arrangement does not have to limited to designated electronic equipment, but may apply to diverse electronic equipment (col. 6, lines 3-5). Thus, the controller of a vehicle refueling system is considered to be diverse electronic equipment.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 5, 10, and 13-18 are allowed, for the prior art of record did not meet the limitations as claimed by the applicant as follows:

- An electrical chip that is housed within a plug, which is irremovably inserted into a bore of a formed body (body could be a vehicle).
- A plug, which has an embedded electrical chip, that is to resemble a bolt.
- The plug includes a pair of extension portions to prevent removal
- A housing that includes two sections that are to be connected to each other
- A printed circuit board, which is in a U-shaped configuration, that has an electrical chip mounted, and the PCB is to have two leg portions that are joined in a narrow juncture.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Ando (US 6285076) teaches a press connection semiconductor device that consists of a printed circuit board (PCB) that is of a U-shaped configuration.
- Baek et al. (US 6326686) teaches a vertical semiconductor device package that has a PCB that is of a U-shaped configuration as a means to assist with the dissipation of heat within the electrical device.
- Tatewaki et al. (US 6402354) teaches an indirect lighting system for the interior of a vehicle, and the system consist of a PCB that has electrical chips mounted on it.
- Gottlieb (US 6078256) teaches a dead-bolt monitoring unit that has an electrical chip (being the RF transmitter) inside of the bolt unit.
- Haimovich (US 6116298) teaches a wireless system for authorizing and monitoring fuel delivery.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Hamilton whose telephone number is 703.305.8975. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday – Friday between the hours of 7am - 3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Horabik can be reached on 703.305.4704. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/057,990
Art Unit: 2635

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kimberly Hamilton
Examiner
Art Unit 2635
4 March 2004

KYH

MICHAEL HORABIK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

